

1 MCGREGOR W. SCOTT  
United States Attorney  
2 ANGELA SCOTT  
Assistant United States Attorney  
3 2500 Tulare Street, Suite 4401  
Fresno, CA 93721  
4 Telephone: (559) 497-4000  
Facsimile: (559) 497-4099  
5

6 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
United States of America  
7

8  
9 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
10 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

11 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
12  
Plaintiff,  
13  
v.  
14 TIRSO GARCIA-VALDEZ,  
MISAEEL GARCIA CARRANZA, and  
15 BRENDA CARMONA-VENEGAS,  
16  
Defendants.

CASE NO. 1:20-CR-00044 DAD-BAM

STIPULATION REGARDING EXCLUDABLE  
TIME PERIODS UNDER SPEEDY TRIAL ACT;  
AND ORDER

DATE: October 14, 2020

TIME: 1:00 p.m.

COURT: Hon. Barbara A. McAuliffe

17  
18 This case is set for status conference on October 14, 2020. On May 13, 2020, this Court issued  
19 General Order 618, which suspends all jury trials in the Eastern District of California until further  
20 notice, and allows district judges to continue all criminal matters. This and previous General Orders  
21 were entered to address public health concerns related to COVID-19.

22 Although the General Orders address the district-wide health concern, the Supreme Court has  
23 emphasized that the Speedy Trial Act's end-of-justice provision "counteract[s] substantive  
24 openendedness with procedural strictness," "demand[ing] on-the-record findings" in a particular case.  
25 *Zedner v. United States*, 547 U.S. 489, 509 (2006). "[W]ithout on-the-record findings, there can be no  
26 exclusion under" § 3161(h)(7)(A). *Id.* at 507. Moreover, any such failure cannot be harmless. *Id.* at  
27 509; *see also United States v. Ramirez-Cortez*, 213 F.3d 1149, 1153 (9th Cir. 2000) (explaining that a  
28 judge ordering an ends-of-justice continuance must set forth explicit findings on the record "either orally

1 or in writing”).

2 Based on the plain text of the Speedy Trial Act—which *Zedner* emphasizes as both mandatory  
3 and inexcusable—General Orders 611, 612, and 617 require specific supplementation. Ends-of-justice  
4 continuances are excludable only if “the judge granted such continuance on the basis of his findings that  
5 the ends of justice served by taking such action outweigh the best interest of the public and the  
6 defendant in a speedy trial.” 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). Moreover, no such period is excludable unless  
7 “the court sets forth, in the record of the case, either orally or in writing, its reason or finding that the  
8 ends of justice served by the granting of such continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and  
9 the defendant in a speedy trial.” *Id.*

10 The General Orders exclude delay in the “ends of justice.” 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7) (Local Code  
11 T4). Although the Speedy Trial Act does not directly address continuances stemming from pandemics,  
12 natural disasters, or other emergencies, this Court has discretion to order a continuance in such  
13 circumstances. For example, the Ninth Circuit affirmed a two-week ends-of-justice continuance  
14 following Mt. St. Helens’ eruption. *Furlow v. United States*, 644 F.2d 764 (9th Cir. 1981). The court  
15 recognized that the eruption made it impossible for the trial to proceed. *Id.* at 767-68; *see also United*  
16 *States v. Correa*, 182 F. Supp. 326, 329 (S.D.N.Y. 2001) (citing *Furlow* to exclude time following the  
17 September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks and the resultant public emergency). The coronavirus is posing a  
18 similar, albeit more enduring, barrier to the prompt proceedings mandated by the statutory rules.

19 In light of the societal context created by the foregoing, this Court should consider the following  
20 case-specific facts in finding excludable delay appropriate in this particular case under the ends-of-  
21 justice exception, § 3161(h)(7) (Local Code T4).<sup>1</sup> If continued, this Court should designate a new date  
22 for the status conference. *United States v. Lewis*, 611 F.3d 1172, 1176 (9th Cir. 2010) (noting any  
23 pretrial continuance must be “specifically limited in time”).

## 24 STIPULATION

25 Plaintiff United States of America, by and through its counsel of record, and defendant TIRSO  
26 GARCIA-VALDEZ, by and through defendant’s counsel of record, Mark Broughton, defendant

---

27 <sup>1</sup> The parties note that General Order 612 acknowledges that a district judge may make  
28 “additional findings to support the exclusion” at the judge’s discretion. General Order 612, ¶ 5 (E.D.  
Cal. March 18, 2020).

MISAEEL GARCIA-CARRANZA, by and through defendant's counsel of record, Roger Wilson, and defendant BRENDA CARMONZ-VENEGAS, by and through defendant's counsel of record, Charles Lee, hereby stipulate as follows:

1. By previous order, this matter was set for status on October 14, 2020.

2. By this stipulation, defendants now move to continue the status conference until January 27, 2021, and to exclude time between October 14, 2020, and January 27, 2021, under Local Code T4.

3. The parties agree and stipulate, and request that the Court find the following:

a) The government has represented that the discovery associated with this case includes over 60 audio and video recordings and over 1,000 pages of Bates stamped discovery. All of this discovery has been either produced directly to counsel and/or made available for inspection and copying.

b) Counsel for defendants desire additional time to consult with their clients, to review the current charges, to conduct investigation and research related to the charges, to review and copy discovery for this matter, to discuss potential resolutions with their clients, to prepare pretrial motions, and to otherwise prepare for trial.

c) Counsel for defendants believe that failure to grant the above-requested continuance would deny them the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.

d) The government does not object to the continuance.

e) Based on the above-stated findings, the ends of justice served by continuing the case as requested outweigh the interest of the public and the defendant in a trial within the original date prescribed by the Speedy Trial Act.

f) For the purpose of computing time under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161, et seq., within which trial must commence, the time period of October 14, 2020 to January 27, 2021, inclusive, is deemed excludable pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A), B(iv) [Local Code T4] because it results from a continuance granted by the Court at defendant's request on the basis of the Court's finding that the ends of justice served by taking such action outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.

4. Nothing in this stipulation and order shall preclude a finding that other provisions of the Speedy Trial Act dictate that additional time periods are excludable from the period within which a trial must commence.

IT IS SO STIPULATED.

Dated: October 5, 2020

McGREGOR W. SCOTT  
United States Attorney

/s/ ANGELA SCOTT  
ANGELA SCOTT  
Assistant United States Attorney

Dated: October 5, 2020

/s/ per email authorization  
MARK A. BROUGHTON  
Counsel for Defendant  
TIRSO GARCIA-VALDEZ

Dated: October 5, 2020

/s/ per email authorization  
ROGER WILSON  
Counsel for Defendant  
MISAEEL GARCIA-  
CARRANZA

Dated: October 5, 2020

/s/ per email authorization  
CHARLES LEE  
Counsel for Defendant  
BRENDA CARMONA-  
VENEGAS

**ORDER**

IT IS SO ORDERED that the Status Conference is continued from October 13, 2020 to **January 27, 2021, at 1:00 p.m. before Magistrate Judge Barbara A. McAuliffe.** Time is excluded pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A), B(iv).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **October 6, 2020**

/s/ *Barbara A. McAuliffe*  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE